

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,865	01/29/2004		Hongyong Zhang	0756-7252	2631
31780	7590	12/07/2005		EXAMINER	
ERIC ROB	INSON		SMOOT, STEPHEN W		
PMB 955				ADTIBUT	DARCE NUMBER
21010 SOUT	THBANK	ST.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
POTOMAC FALLS, VA 20165				2813	

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			-n
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/765,865	ZHANG ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen W. Smoot	2813	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
<ul> <li>1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 C</u></li> <li>2a)  This action is <b>FINAL</b>. 2b)  This</li> <li>3)  Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E</li> </ul>	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers	wn from consideration.		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2004 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	: a)⊠ accepted or b)☐ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Set tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati nity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No. <u>08/504,087</u> . ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) \( \sum \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) \( \sum \) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)		
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1-29-04.</li> </ul>		atent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/765,865 Page 2

Art Unit: 2813

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office action is in response to applicant's amendment received on 07 October 2005.

#### Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of group I, claims 1-24, and cancellation of the non-elected claims, claims 25-28, in the reply received on 07 October 2005 is acknowledged.

# Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422

Application/Control Number: 10/765,865

Art Unit: 2813

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Page 3

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-24 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24, respectively, of U.S. Patent No. 6,689,651 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the applicant's invention claims the genus "light attenuating means", while the '651 patent claims the species "at least one light attenuating filter", which is a type of light attenuating means. Accordingly, claims 1-24 of the '651 patent have all of the limitations as respectively set forth in claims 1-24 of the applicant's invention.

## Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Noguchi et al. teach a method of crystallizing an amorphous silicon film by using a laser equipped with an oscillator, an attenuator, and a homogenizer.

Application/Control Number: 10/765,865 Page 4

Art Unit: 2813

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen W. Smoot whose telephone number is 571-272-1698. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 am to 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-1702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**SWS** 

STEPHEN W. SMOOT PRIMARY EXAMINER